

Appl. No. 10/700,614
Atty. Docket No. 9422L
Response dated 10/20/2006
Reply to Office Action of 08/23/2006
Customer No. 27752

Claims 1 and 8-11 of U.S. Patent 6,808,586 B1 issued to Steinhardt in view of U.S. Patent 3,907,628 issued to Buske.

Without admitting that the basis for the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is proper, the Applicants are submitting a Terminal Disclaimer herewith with respect to U.S. Patent 6,808,586 B1. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

B. Claim 13.

The Office Action states that Claim 13 was rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as purportedly being unpatentable over Claims 1 and 8-11 of U.S. Patent 6,808,586 B1 issued to Steinhardt in view of U.S. Patent 4,711,682 issued to Forselius, et al.

Without admitting that the basis for the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is proper, the Applicants are submitting a Terminal Disclaimer herewith with respect to U.S. Patent 6,808,586 B1. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

III. Summary.

All of the rejections have been addressed. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By


Signature

Jeffrey V. Bamber

Typed or Printed Name

Registration No. 31,148

(513) 634-8452

October 20, 2006
Customer No. 27752

Page 2 of 2

BEST AVAILABLE COPY